

REMARKS

The Applicants and the Examiner held an interview by telephone on November 13, 2007. At this interview, a summary of the invention was discussed, along with proposed changes to the independent claims. Agreement was reached on claim amendments that would distinguish over the cited prior art and overcome the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection. The Applicants thank the Examiner for his time and helpful assistance during the interview.

This amendment is filed in response to the Office communication dated October 2, 2007. Amendments to the claims are as follows:

Claims 5, 10, 13, 16, 17, 22, 25-28 and 30-31 are amended to correct antecedent basis.

Claims 13-31 are amended to address the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection.

Claims 1, 13, 25 and 29 are amended to address the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection. Their respective dependent claims 2-7, 14-19, 27-28, 30-31 are also amended to reflect the changes to the independent claims.

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of all claims and favorable action in this case.

Also, the Office communication of October 2, 2007 did not address the Amendments to the Specification on page 2 of the Amendment in Response to Non-final Office Action dated July 10, 2007. The Applicants respectfully request acknowledgement of said amendments to the specification.

Response to Rejections of Claims at Issue

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101 and Claim Objections:

Claims 13, 25, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Said claims were also objected to because of the word “tangibly.”

The Office action also requested the Applicants to change the phrase “computer-readable medium” to “computer-readable storage medium.”

Accordingly, the Applicants have removed the word “tangibly” and have amended claims 13, 25, and 29 to claim “a computer-readable storage medium ~~tangibly~~ embodying a program of instructions executable by a computer for performing steps to....” as suggested on page 4 of the 10/2/07 Office communication. The Applicants also have amended the claims to state that “the instructions being embodied where they are executed by some type of processing system, and where the instructions enable the system to perform the actions” (10/2/07 Office action, page 4, paragraph 1).

Dependent claims 14-24, 26-28 and 30-31 are also amended to reflect the changes to their respective independent claims.

As agreed upon during the interview of November 13, 2007, these changes result in the amended claims being compliant with 35 U.S.C. §101.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b):

Claim Amendments:

Claims 1-31 were rejected as being anticipated by Microsoft (“ASP.NET QuickStarts Tutorial”, dated 2002, hereinafter referred to as “App_trace”). Specifically, the Response to Arguments of the Office communication noted that the contents of the preamble and the features relied upon in the Amendment in Response to Non-Final Office Action dated July 10, 2007 were not limitations of the claims. Also, the term “linking information” was interpreted broadly.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 13, 25 and 29 are amended to address the Response to Arguments and the U.S. 102(b) rejection in the manner agreed upon at the interview of November 13, 2007. Their respective dependent claims are amended to reflect the changes to their respective independent claims. The amendments and their corresponding

support are detailed below. Please note that throughout this Amendment, the specification will be cited by referring to the column and line number as (spec, col:line). For example, the specification, column 1, lines 6-14, is cited as “(spec, 1:6-14)”.

Claim 1 is amended to more distinctly point out that the claim is directed to “the execution of a single request across a request identification boundary.” Support for the descriptive, limiting terms “execution” and “single” may be found in (spec, 2:4-8, 3:10-11, 14:9-14, and 22:12-14), among others.

Claim 1 also is amended to add the element “providing a trace log for recording one or more events that occur during the execution of the single request across the request identification boundary, the request identification boundary comprising a change to an identification of the single request during the occurrence of the one or more events.” Support for providing the trace log may be found in (spec, 3:1-2, 4:17-20, 4:30-5:1, and 12:12-20), and support for the definition of “request identification boundary” may be found in (spec, 4:2-7, 4:24-27 and 12:20-23).

The last element of claim 1 is amended to: “storing linking information within the trace log comprising marking, within the trace log, the change to the identification of the request from the first request identification to the second request identification.” Support for this amendment may be found in (spec, 5:1-5 and 12:16-23).

Remarks:

For clarity’s sake in these remarks, only claim 1 is referred to, however, the discussion of the claim amendments also apply to claims 13, 15 and 29.

App_trace does not disclose the first element of amended claim 1: “providing a trace log for recording one or more events that occur during the execution of the single request across the request identification boundary, the request identification boundary comprising a change to an identification of the single request during the occurrence of the one or more events.”

App_trace does not disclose providing a trace log for recording events executed during the execution of a single request across a request identification boundary. In App_trace, the identification of the single request is listed as “Session ID” and is consistently referred to as “Session ID” throughout the trace request (App_trace, Request Detail, Value, Session ID for this request). A request identification boundary comprising a change to the identification of the single request across various events that occur during the execution of the request is not disclosed by App_trace. A trace log that records events during the change to the identification of the request across this boundary is also not disclosed. In App_trace, execution of the request is by a single application that refers to the request as “Session ID”, and this identification does not change.

App_trace does not disclose the third element of amended claim 1: “second recording, within the trace log, a second event including a second request identification.” A recorded second event is disclosed by App_trace, however, this second event does not include a second request identification; it still uses “Session ID” to identify the request.

App_trace also does not disclose the last element of amended claim 1: “storing linking information within the trace log comprising marking, within the trace log, the change to the identification of the request from the first request identification to the second request identification.” In App_trace, the sequence numbers of the requests (i.e., 1, 2, 3, 4...) in the “No.” column do not mark a change of the identification of the request from a first identification to a second identification, as no second identification is disclosed by App_trace. The sequence number serves as a count of the number of requests for which trace information will be collected (App_trace, paragraph 2, lines 1-2), but the actual request identification stays the same for each request (i.e., App_trace, Request Detail, Value, Session ID for this request). A change to the identification of the request is not disclosed by App_trace.

The present application provides benefit over App_trace by disclosing a method and a computer-readable storage medium for supporting a method of tracking a request across a request identification boundary, where the identification of the request changes from one side of the boundary to the other (e.g., thread/process changes, machine transfers, etc.) (spec, 4:3-7). App_trace is capable of tracing a request through an individual application where the

request identification/identifier remains constant, however, App_trace does not disclose a method to address tracing when the request's identification changes. App_trace could theoretically run independently on each side of a request identification boundary, but App_trace does not disclose the linking piece for a request traveling across the boundary, where the identification of the request changes. The present application provides an advantage of automatically being able to link the two traces together, thus saving the time and effort of needed to match and reconstruct internal request identifications across machines, processes, and other such boundaries where a request identification changes.

The idea of tracking "across a request identification boundary, comprising a change in the identification of a request" is clearly illustrated by Figure 5a of the specification. HTTP.SYS, IIS Server, ISAPI, and ASP.NET each receive the request and assign an internal identifier to the request. The request is tracked across these identification boundaries and the linking information for the entire request is stored in the rectangle at the bottom. Note that ASP.NET of Fig. 5a is one of the identification boundaries; ASP.NET runs a specific application to operate on the request and then passes along the request handling to ISAPI. In fact, ASP.NET as discussed in App_trace could also be involved in the request scenario for Fig. 5a, but its log would only contain information pertinent to the application's execution in [step 7. Script executes] for this request. App_trace, since it is wholly contained in ASP.NET [step 7. Script executes], is not able to cross boundaries and coordinate different internal request identifiers, and does not have a method for tracking across those boundaries to link the information for the request.

As App_trace does not disclose the first, third, and last elements of amended claim 1, App_trace does not anticipate amended claim 1. Claims 13, 25 and 29 are amended similarly to the amendments of claim 1, and thus are also not anticipated by App_trace. Dependent claims 2-12, 14-24, 26-28 and 30-31 incorporate every element of their respective independent claims, and therefore are also not anticipated by App_trace. Accordingly, the Applicants believe that pending claims 1-31 are in a condition for allowance under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and arguments, the Applicants submit the pending application is in condition for allowance and an early action so indicating is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (312) 474-6300. Applicants believe no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 13-2855, under Order No. **30835/154731** from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: December 3, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By___/W. J. Kramer #46,229/____
William J. Kramer

Registration No.: 46,229
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300
Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300
Attorney for Applicants